



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,783	10/31/2003	David S. Benco	LUTZ 2 00250	1742
48116 7590 10/12/2010				
FAY SHARPE/LUCENT				
1228 Euclid Avenue, 5th Floor				
The Halle Building				
Cleveland, OH 44115-1843				
EXAMINER				
DEAN, RAYMOND S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/698,783

Applicant(s)

BENCO, DAVID S.

Examiner

RAYMOND S. DEAN

Art Unit

2618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on October 31, 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicants' assertion-"It is submitted that a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to render the claims obvious" and "one of skill in the art would not look to any of Shinohara" (See Page 4, 1st Paragraph of Applicants Remarks).

Nayak's step of determining whether a destination mobile device can receive video data could have been substituted with the features taught in Shinohara (See Office Action dated March 5, 2010 for detail on the features taught by Shinohara) as an alternative means for achieving the predictable result of determining whether the destination mobile can receive video data. The combination of Nayak and Shinohara would have also resulted in the avoidance of the problem of the inability of the destination mobile to receive a multimedia message as taught by Shinohara. Modifying Nayak further with Pyhalammi results in allowing data traffic on the wireless network to be more evenly distributed over a twenty-four day cycle, thus actually increasing the total network throughput, without having to upgrade the wireless network components. Modifying Nayak still further with Ellis results in providing the user with the flexibility of choosing when said user wants the desired video content. Therefore the above combination would be made and render the claims obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5, 7, 10 - 15, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273) and in further view of Ellis (US 2004/0103434)

Regarding Claim 1, Nayak teaches a system to provide transmission of video data from a first mobile station to a second mobile station in a network, the system comprising: a mobile switching center, wherein the mobile switching center comprises: a call recognition module operative to recognize a call from the first mobile station to the second mobile station as including the video data (Sections 0010, 0027) and, if the video data is present, validate the second mobile station as capable of receiving the video data (Section 0027).

Nayak does not teach determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database, wherein a subscriber sets the delivery preference by selecting immediate delivery, delayed delivery, blocked delivery, or conditional delivery, a storage module operative to have stored therein the video data; an announcement module operative to selectively prompt, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second

mobile station is validated, receive a response to the prompt from the second mobile station and selectively forward the response; and, a control module operative to store the video data in the storage module upon recognition, receive the response from the announcement module and, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, perform at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the video data to the second mobile station.

Shinohara, which also teaches determining whether the destination mobile device can receive video data, teaches determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station (Section 0049, the delivery preference is to have multimedia message that is held in the MMS servers immediately forwarded), a storage module operative to have stored therein the video data (Section 0036); an announcement module operative to selectively prompt, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated (Sections 0045 – 0047, the prompt is the incoming call notification), receive a response to the prompt from the second mobile station and selectively forward the response (Sections 0048, 0049, the response is the reception request); and, a control module operative to store the video data in the storage module upon recognition (Section 0047, upon recognizing a received multimedia message comprising video data said video data is stored in the appropriate server), receive the response from the announcement module and, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, perform at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the

video data to the second mobile station (Sections 0048 – 0049, the video data is forwarded to the mobile telephones).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the above features of Shinohara as an alternative means for achieving the predictable result of determining whether the destination mobile device can receive video data.

Pyhalammi, which also teaches a messaging system that delivers content to mobile devices, teaches the feature of determining a delivery preference for a mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database (Section 0021 lines 1 - 8, lines 10 - 13, the user selects from a list, which is the database, of delivery classes or options).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara with the above delivery preference feature for the purpose of allowing data traffic on the wireless network to be more evenly distributed over a twenty-four day cycle, thus actually increasing the total network throughput, without having to upgrade the wireless network components as taught by Pyhalammi.

Ellis, which also teaches the delivery of video data to the end user, teaches wherein a subscriber sets the delivery preference by selecting immediate delivery, delayed delivery, blocked delivery, or conditional delivery (Section 0156, user can choose the option deliver the video data another time, which is a delay in the delivery).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above system of Nayak in view of Shinohara and in further view of Pyhalammi with the above concept of Ellis for the purpose of providing the user with the flexibility of choosing when said user wants the desired video content delivered as taught by Ellis.

Regarding Claim 10, Nayak teaches a method for transmitting video data from a first mobile station to a second mobile station in a network, the method comprising: recognizing a call from the first mobile station to the second mobile station as including the video data, wherein the recognizing is executed within a mobile switching center (Sections 0010, 0027); if the video data is present, validating the second mobile station as capable of receiving the video data (Section 0027) and wherein the validating is executed within the mobile switching center (Section 0027).

Nayak does not teach determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database; wherein a subscriber sets the delivery preference by selecting immediate delivery, delayed delivery, blocked delivery, or conditional delivery, storing the video data in a storage module; selectively prompting, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated; receiving a response to the prompt from the second mobile station; and, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, performing at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the video data to the second mobile station

Shinohara, which also teaches determining whether the destination mobile device can receive video data, teaches determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station (Section 0049, the delivery preference is to have multimedia message that is held in the MMS servers immediately forwarded); storing the video data in a storage module (Section 0036); selectively prompting, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated (Sections 0045 – 0047, the prompt is the incoming call notification); receiving a response to the prompt from the second mobile station (Sections 0048, 0049, the response is the reception request); and, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, performing at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the video data to the second mobile station (Sections 0048 – 0049, the video data is forwarded to the mobile telephones).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the above features of Shinohara as an alternative means for achieving the predictable result of determining whether the destination mobile device can receive video data.

Pyhalammi, which also teaches a messaging system that delivers content to mobile devices, teaches the feature of determining a delivery preference for a mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database (Section 0021 lines 1 - 8, lines 10 - 13, the user selects from a list, which is the database, of delivery classes or options).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Shinohara with the above delivery preference feature for the purpose of allowing data traffic on the wireless network to be more evenly distributed over a twenty-four day cycle, thus actually increasing the total network throughput, without having to upgrade the wireless network components as taught by Pyhalammi.

Ellis, which also teaches the delivery of video data to the end user, teaches wherein a subscriber sets the delivery preference by selecting immediate delivery, delayed delivery, blocked delivery, or conditional delivery (Section 0156, user can choose the option deliver the video data another time, which is a delay in the delivery).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above system of Nayak in view of Shinohara and in further view of Pyhalammi with the above concept of Ellis for the purpose of providing the user with the flexibility of choosing when said user wants the desired video content delivered as taught by Ellis.

Regarding Claims 2, 11, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view Pyhalammi and in further view of Ellis teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10. Shinohara further teaches wherein the call recognition module validates the second mobile station by performing a look-up operation on a mobile subscriber database (Sections 0037, 0045).

Regarding Claims 4, 12, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view Pyhalammi and in further view of Ellis teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10.

Shinohara further teaches wherein the prompt comprises a ringing tone (Sections 0047 – 0048, typical mobile phones are notified of an incoming call via a ringing tone).

Regarding Claims 5, 13, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view Pyhalammi and in further view of Ellis teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10.

Shinohara further teaches wherein the prompt comprises an announcement (Section 0047, the notification is the announcement).

Regarding Claims 14, 19, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view Pyhalammi and in further view of Ellis teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10.

Shinohara further teaches wherein the response comprises at least one of a rejection of the video data, a request for immediate delivery of the video data, and a request for delayed delivery of the video data (Sections 0048 – 0049).

Regarding Claims 7, 15, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view Pyhalammi and in further view of Ellis teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10. Shinohara further teaches a call origination module operative to originate, based on the delivery preference, a subsequent call to the second mobile station to selectively prompt, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated (Sections 0044 - 0045, 0047), receive the response to the prompt from the second mobile station and selectively forward the response to the control module (Sections 0048 – 0049).

4. Claims 18, 20, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of

Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273) and in further view of Kring et al. (US 2003/0105825).

Regarding Claim 18, Nayak teaches a system for transmitting video data from a first mobile station to a second mobile station in a network, the system comprising: a mobile switching center, wherein the mobile switching center comprises: means for recognizing a call from the first mobile station to the second mobile station as including the video data (Sections 0010, 0027); means for validating the second mobile station as capable of receiving the video data (Section 0027).

Nayak does not teach determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database, wherein the delivery preferences include a rejection of video data, immediate delivery of video data, delayed delivery of video data and conditional delivery of video data; means for storing the video data in a storage module; means for selectively prompting the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated; means for receiving a response to the prompt from the second mobile station; and, means for performing, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the video data to the second mobile station

Shinohara, which also teaches determining whether the destination mobile device can receive video data, teaches determining a delivery preference for the second mobile station (Section 0049, the delivery preference is to have multimedia message that is held in the MMS servers immediately forwarded), wherein the delivery

preferences include immediate delivery of video data (Section 0049, multimedia message that is held in the MMS servers immediately forwarded upon receipt of the reception requests) and conditional delivery of video data (Section 0049, the delivery preference is to have multimedia message that is held in the MMS servers immediately forwarded, the video data will be delivered if the user sends a reception request, which is the condition, thus there will be conditional delivery of data), means for storing the video data in a storage module (Section 0036); means for selectively prompting the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated (Sections 0045 – 0047, the prompt is the incoming call notification); means for receiving a response to the prompt from the second mobile station (Sections 0048, 0049, the response is the reception request), and, means for performing, based on at least one of the delivery preference and the response, at least one of maintaining the video data in the storage module, deleting the video data from the storage module, and forwarding the video data to the second mobile station (Sections 0048 – 0049, the video data is forwarded to the mobile telephones).

Pyhalammi, which also teaches a messaging system that delivers content to mobile devices, teaches the feature of determining a delivery preference for a mobile station based at least in part on information retrieved from at least one database (Section 0021 lines 1 - 8, lines 10 - 13, the user selects from a list, which is the database, of delivery classes or options) and a delivery preference that includes delayed delivery of video data (Sections 0021 lines 1 - 8, 0029 lines 1 - 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara with the above delivery preference feature for the purpose of allowing data traffic on the wireless network to be more evenly distributed over a twenty-four day cycle, thus actually increasing the total network throughput, without having to upgrade the wireless network components as taught by Pyhalammi.

Kring teaches delivery preferences including a rejection of video data and delayed delivery of the video data (Sections 0010 lines 1 – 4, 0034, 0058 lines 1 – 8, 0093 – 0098, discarding a message corresponds to rejection of a message).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara and in further view of Pyhalammi with the policy based management feature of Kring for the purpose of improving data management in the mobile network as taught by Kring.

Regarding Claim 20, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 18. Shinohara further teaches a call origination module operative to originate, based on the delivery preference, a subsequent call to the second mobile station to selectively prompt, based on the delivery preference, the second mobile station if the second mobile station is validated (Sections 0044 - 0045, 0047), receive the response to the prompt from the second mobile station and selectively forward the response to the control module (Sections 0048 – 0049).

Regarding Claim 23, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 18. Shinohara further teaches wherein the response comprises at least one of a rejection of the video data, a request for immediate delivery of the video data, and a request for delayed delivery of the video data (Sections 0048 – 0049).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273), as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Tervo et al. (US 2004/0207719).

Regarding Claim 3, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi does not teach wherein the storage module is a first-in, first-out (FIFO) buffer.

Tervo teaches a storage module that is a first-in, first-out buffer (Section 0036 lines 6 – 12).

Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and Tervo both teach an MMS system in which video data is stored for subsequent forwarding to a mobile terminal thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the first-in, first-out buffer of Tervo as an alternative means for achieving the same predictable result of storing video data for subsequent forwarding to a mobile terminal.

6. Claims 8, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273), as applied to Claims 1, 10 above, and further in view of Cox et al. (US 2001/0044325).

Regarding Claims 8, 16, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10. Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi does not teach wherein the announcement module provides a signal to the first mobile station that delivery will be blocked if the call recognition module does not validate the second mobile station.

Cox teaches providing a signal to a mobile station that delivery will be blocked if the called device is not validated (Section 0048).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi with the call blocking circuitry and method of Cox for the purpose of enabling an effective management of the wireless telephones by an organization that issues said wireless telephones to selected employees as taught by Cox thus adding versatility to the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi via enabling the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi to be used in a corporate environment.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of Pyhalammi et

al. (US 2003/0045273) in view of Kring et al. (US 2003/0105825), as applied to Claim 18 above, and further in view of Cox et al. (US 2001/0044325).

Regarding Claim 21, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 18. Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring does not teach wherein the announcement module provides a signal to the first mobile station that delivery will be blocked if the call recognition module does not validate the second mobile station.

Cox teaches providing a signal to a mobile station that delivery will be blocked if the called device is not validated (Section 0048).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring with the call blocking circuitry and method of Cox for the purpose of enabling an effective management of the wireless telephones by an organization that issues said wireless telephones to selected employees as taught by Cox thus adding versatility to the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring thus enabling the system of Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring to be used in a corporate environment.

8. Claims 9, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of

Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273), as applied to Claims 1, 10 above, and further in view of Turunen (US 7,289,792)

Regarding Claims 9, 17, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1, 10. Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi does not teach wherein the control module deletes the video data from the storage module if the call recognition module does not validate the second mobile station.

Turunen teaches a multimedia system in which video data is deleted from storage (Cols. 1 lines 21 – 31, 9 lines 29 – 58, the store and forward feature comprises storing the message temporarily and then forwarding said message, which further comprises deleting said message from storage).

Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and Turunen both teach a wireless multimedia system in which video data is stored and forwarded to mobile devices thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the store and forward method of Turunen as an alternative means for achieving the same predictable result of storing and forwarding video data to mobile devices.

9. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nayak (US 2004/0180689) in view of Shinohara (US 2002/0132608) in view of Pyhalammi et al. (US 2003/0045273) in view of Kring et al. (US 2003/0105825), as applied to Claim 18 above, and further in view of Turunen (US 7,289,792)

Regarding Claim 22, Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 18.

Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi and in further view of Kring does not teach wherein the control module deletes the video data from the storage module if the call recognition module does not validate the second mobile station.

Turunen teaches a multimedia system in which video data is deleted from storage (Cols. 1 lines 21 – 31, 9 lines 29 – 58, the store and forward feature comprises storing the message temporarily and then forwarding said message, which further comprises deleting said message from storage).

Nayak in view of Shinohara in view of Pyhalammi in further view of Kring and Turunen both teach a wireless multimedia system in which video data is stored and forwarded to mobile devices thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the store and forward method of Turunen as an alternative means for achieving the same predictable result of storing and forwarding video data to mobile devices.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAYMOND S. DEAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raymond S Dean/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618
Raymond S. Dean

Application/Control Number: 10/698,783
Art Unit: 2618

Page 19

October 8, 2010